UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/714,785	11/15/2000	Jonathan J. Hull	15358-006110US	5217

20350 7590 04/09/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
SCHRANTZ, STEPHEN D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/714,785	HULL ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steve Schrantz	2177	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 August 2001* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *20-23 and 31* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19 and 24-30* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 November 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *6 and 7* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant has elected Group I, pertaining to claims 1-19 and 24-30. Claims 20-23 and 31 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Election/Restrictions

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-19 and 24-30, drawn to a visitor information gathering apparatus, classified in class 707, subclass 104.1.

II. Claims 20-23, drawn to a system for tracking activity within a facility, classified in class 342, subclass 350.

III. Claim 31, drawn to a method for providing an image, classified in class 345, subclass 418.

3. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions of Group I, II, and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct from each other if they are shown to be separately usable. In the instant case, each of the separate inventions has a separate utility as in a system not having the others. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Groups I, II, or III are not required for any of the other groups, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. During a telephone conversation with Sujit Kotwal on March 13, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-19 and 24-30. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 20-23 and 31 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Information Disclosure Statement

8. The Eldridge et al. reference was repeated twice in the IDS. The Eldridge reference of paper no. 6 filed 11-15-01 has been crossed through. The reference is considered and initialed in the IDS of paper no. 7 filed 8-6-01.

Drawings

9. The drawings filed on Nov. 15, 2000 have been approved by the draftsperson.

Claim Objections

10. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The claim states "comprises at least one of an image, a time of entering said personnel information". A conjunction is needed between "... of an image [or, and] a time ...".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

13. Claim 27 recites the limitation "personnel database" in claim 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation because there is no "personnel database" in the independent claim.

14. Claims 27-30 recite the limitation "personnel information" in claim 25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation because there is no "personnel information" in the independent claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

15. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

16. Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9, 16, 18, and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41).

17. Kamise teaches independent claim 1 by the following:

"a display" at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise teaches that the visit destination is displayed to the user.

"at least one of a plurality of input devices" at page 12-13. Kamise teaches that the visit destination is selected. Because a destination is selected, an input device must be available for the visitor to select the destination.

"a storage" at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise teaches a database in which the picture of a person and his business card is transmitted. Because a visitor's database is created, the information must be stored in the database.

"a processor" at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise teaches a PC that is in connection with the system. It is common knowledge that a PC contains a processor. The processor is the device in the computer (PC) that interprets and executes instructions

"a least one of a plurality of sensors, wherein said processor gathers information about visitors from said at least one of a plurality of input devices from responses made by said visitors to prompts provided by said processor through said display" at pages 12-13. Kamise teaches that a visit destination is displayed through the unmanned reception machine. Kamise then teaches that the visitor selects a visit destination.

"wherein said processor substantially contemporaneously gathers information about said visitors from said at least one of a plurality of sensors" at pages 12-13. Kamise teaches the use of sensors [in the form of a camera and a scanner] that capture images of a business card and the face of the visitor are taken. The pictures of the face and business card are the gathered information about the visitors. The gathering of the information is considered substantially

contemporaneously because the unmanned reception machine transmits the pictures of the visitor's face and business card when the visit destination is selected.

"wherein said processor stores said information about visitors into said storage" at pages 11 and 19-20. The pictures of the visitor's business card and face are sent to the database to prepare a visitors database [the information is stored in the database].

18. Kamise teaches dependent claim 4 by the following:

"wherein said information about visitors is at least one of a name, an organization represented by a visitor, a purpose of a visit, a date of a visit, a time of a visit, a person to be visited, an identity of a group of visitors visiting together" at pages 19-20. Kamise teaches that visitor information, such as name, firm [organization] name, visit destination [person to be visited], and the time of visit, is gathered and stored in the database.

19. Kamise teaches dependent claim 6 by the following:

"further comprising a scanner that scans at least one of a first side and a second side of a business card having printing on at least one of said first side and said second side" at page 15. Kamise teaches that a scanner reads the visitor's business card.

"wherein, responsive to detecting text on said at least one of said first side and said second side, said processor processes said text in accordance with a language of said text" at page 23. Kamise teaches that character recognition is performed from the image of the business card. The text retrieved from the card is then stored in the database. Kamise teaches the type of information captured from the card at page 19-20. If the character recognition process can

recover the information from the image, the text was processed in accordance with the language of the text.

20. Kamise teaches dependent claim 7 by the following:

"further comprising a microphone, wherein said microphone provides input of speech of said visitors" at page 10. Kamise teaches the use of a microphone in the system. Kamise further teaches that the microphone collects the voice of the visitor for the receptionist. Kamise also teaches that a conversation between a receptionist and visitor can take place through the speakers and microphones at pages 23-24.

21. Kamise teaches dependent claim 9 by the following:

"further comprising a speaker, wherein said speaker provides directions to said visitor" at page 9. Kamise teaches that a speaker is available in the system. The speaker offers voice guidance [directions] to the visitor. Kamise also teaches the visitor is given more directions about the entrance gates through the speaker [voice] at page 24.

22. Kamise teaches independent claims 16 and 24 by the following:

"gathering information about said visitors in an interactive session with an automated kiosk" at page 12. Kamise teaches that the visit destination is selected. Because the visit destination is selected, the visitor is in an interactive session. Kamise further teaches the automated kiosk at Fig. 3 reference 100.

"placing said information into a format in which said information may be stored" at pages 19-20 and 26. Kamise teaches that the data is used to prepare a visitor database. Because the pictures of the visitor's face and business card are transmitted to a server to prepare a database, the information must be stored in the database. If the information is stored, in must have already been placed in a format to be stored.

"storing said information for retrieval" at pages 19-20 and 26. Kamise teaches that the data is used to prepare a visitor database. Because the pictures of the visitor's face and business card are transmitted to a server to prepare a database, the information must be stored in the database. It is well known in the art that information can be retrieved from a database.

"automatically obtaining information about said visitor from at least one of a plurality of sources" at the solution section of the abstract. The camera automatically obtains the image of the visitor's face. The camera takes the picture for the unmanned reception machine. Because the machine is unmanned, the information is obtained automatically.

23. Kamise teaches the remaining portion of independent claim 24 by the following:

"code for providing said information about said visitor and said information gathered at said kiosk to persons interested in said information" at pages 12-13. Kamise teaches that at least the picture is transmitted to another PC so that the receptionist and visitor can converse.

"a computer readable storage medium for holding the codes" at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise teaches that the system consists of a PC. It is well known in the art that the code to control a computer must be in some form of computer readable storage medium.

24. Kamise teaches dependent claim 18 by the following:

"providing said information about said visitor and said information gathered at said kiosk to at least one of a plurality of other users of said information" at page 24. Kamise teaches that the picture or business are transmitted to the receptionist.

25. Kamise teaches independent claim 25 by the following:

"a display" at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise teaches that the visit destination is displayed to the user.

"at least one of a plurality of input devices" at page 12. Kamise teaches that the visit destination is selected. Because a destination is selected, an input device must be available for the visitor to select the destination.

"a storage" at page 26. Kamise teaches a database in which the picture of a person and his business card is transmitted. Because a visitor's database is prepared, the information must be stored in the database.

"a processor" at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise teaches a PC that is in connection with the system. It is common knowledge that a PC contains a processor. The processor is the device in the computer (PC) that interprets and executes instructions.

"wherein said processor captures information from said at least one of a plurality of input devices" at page 9. The input devices of the CCD camera, the business card image taking-in means [scanner or camera], and the touch panel are available in the system. The pictures of the face and business card are the captured information about the visitors. The touch panel is the input device in which the visitor selects a particular destination.

"said information entered responsive to prompts provided by said processor through said display" at page 12. The display prompts the visitor with destinations from which one is selected. Kamise teaches that a visit destination is selected through the display.

"wherein said processor stores said information about visitors into said storage" at pages 19-20 and 26. The pictures of the visitor's business card and face are sent to the database to prepare a visitors database.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 2, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Takasaki et al. (Japanese Patent JP403129990A Only English Abstract).

As per claim 2, Kamise teaches a reception system in which a camera captures an image of the visitor at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise does not teach that the visitor is unaware of the gathering of information about the visitor. Takasaki does teach a reception system in which the visitor is given a card that stores the information about the visit. When the user enters the card, a picture is taken of the visitor without the user being aware of the collection of the picture data as taught at the constitution of the abstract. The camera in this instance is

considered to be the sensor. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to gather some of the visitor information without the visitor being aware of the gathering of the information because of the advantages of the gathering of information of unaware visitors. By not allowing the visitor to be aware of the gathering of the information, the invention will serve at least two advantages of not upsetting particular visitors and not allowing potential threats to avoid the information gathering process. Some visitors may be upset if they were aware the gathering of personal information, such as taking their picture. By not notifying the user of the gathering of the information, the system can gather the needed information without upsetting the visitor. Some visitors might serve as potential threats that may try to avoid the information gathering process. By not allowing the potential threat visitors to be aware of the gathering process, they will be less likely to avoid the process.

28. Takasaki teaches dependent claim 14 by the following:
"further comprising a telephone interface, said telephone interface providing a telephone message to a person to be visited that said visitors have arrived" at the constitution of the abstract. The visitor arrives and inserts the magnetic card into the reader. The invention then automatically calls the telephone number of the destination to be visited.

29. Kamise and Takasaki teach dependent claim 17 by the following:
"wherein gathering information about said visitors at said automated kiosk comprises obtaining information from said visitor using a process of which said visitor is aware (conscious capture)" at Kamise solution section of abstract. Kamise teaches that the visitor selects the visit

destination. The visit destination is information about the visitor because it describes where he is visiting.

"obtaining information about said visitor using a process of which said visitor is not aware (unconscious capture)" at Takasaki constitution section of abstract. The visitor is not aware of the picture that is taken of him.

30. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Herz (U.S. Patent 6,020,883).

31. As per claim 3, Kamise teaches a visitor kiosk in which a user is checked in for the visitation as taught in the abstract. Kamise does not teach that the apparatus is capable of playing music. Herz does teach the playing of music through an apparatus (kiosk or terminal that the visitor uses) at col. 51 lines 19-39. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to allow the apparatus to play music for the enjoyment of the visitor. Playing music by computer systems is well known in the art. Through the playing of music, the user will entertained while the apparatus gathers the information. It will also allow the user to be entertained while waiting for the person he is visiting.

32. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of McAbian (U.S. Patent 5,845,261).

33. As per claim 5, Kamise teaches an unmanned reception machine. In the abstract, he does not teach the type of information that is displayed to the user. McAbian does teach a greeting that is displayed to the visitor at Fig. 5. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to provide a greeting to a visitor. By displaying a greeting to the visitor, the reception machine will welcome visitors to the location. A greeting will serve as a nicety to the invention. It is more likely to make visitors feel more welcome to the location, and it will serve as a nice introduction to the location.

34. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kanevsky et al. (U.S. Patent 6,334,109).

35. As per claim 8, Kamise teaches the use of CCD camera at the solution section of the abstract to gather the picture information on the visitor. He does not specifically state that the camera is a video camera. Kanevsky does teach that a video camera can send of an image of customer (visitor) to a server at col. 5 lines 58-60. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use a video camera. A video camera is equally capable of gathering images of a visitor and is also well known in the art.

36. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Motomiya et al. (U.S. Patent 6,189,783).

37. As per claim 10, Kamise teaches an unmanned reception machine that uses a visitor wand [the entry card] to determine the location of a visitor and the time he passed a particular gate at pages 18-19. Kamise does not teach that the visitor wand records the experiences of a visitor. Motomiya does teach the use of a visitor wand capable of recording the visitor's experience at col. 1 lines 9-16, col. 5 lines 6-8, and col. 10 lines 3-5. Motomiya further shows the recording of the visitor's experiences through Fig. 18. The figure shows those attractions that have been visited, and those that the user has not yet visited. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to record the visitor's experiences through a visitor wand. By recording the experiences of the user, the system can display the activities the user has already experienced. It is also capable of storing information that the user may need for full enjoyment of his experience (such as the attractions visited, messages from people from his group, and several other advantages that a recording medium may offer).

38. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Coffin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,991,429).

39. As per claim 11, Kamise teaches that a camera takes a picture of a visitor at the solution section of the abstract. Kamise does not teach the use of biometrics with the image. Coffin does teach the use of biometrics with the facial image of a person, or visitor, at col. 1 lines 5-9. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use biometrics to determine the identity of a user. Through the use of biometrics, the invention would be capable of identifying visitors. The biometric system extracts particular features of the

image and then compares these features with other images. Through the comparison, the invention will identify potential matches for the visitor's identity. The determination of a visitor's identity assists in determining who the user is without them entering their name. It allows the system to determine people who may be using false identities. Finally, it allows the system to identify visitors who may be potential threats.

40. Coffin teaches dependent claim 13 by the following:
"further comprising a security sensors, said security sensors providing information about potential threats" at col. 1 lines 47-50. The invention is capable of detecting potential threats, such as the unwanted persons (terrorists or fugitives).

41. Claim12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) and Coffin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,991,429) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Bellegarda (U.S. Patent 5,502,774).

42. As per claim 12, Coffin teaches the use of biometrics to identify the visitor as taught at col. 1 lines 5-7. Coffin does not teach that handwriting or voice can be used to identify a person. Bellegarda teaches that both voice and handwriting can be used to identify a user, a visitor in this instance at col. 1 lines 28-40. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the additional types of biometrics to better ensure the identity of a user. By using these additional forms of biometrics, the invention will be capable of accepting

more ways of inputting information, such as a handwriting tablet and a microphone, but the system can also better detect the identity of the visitor through these forms of input.

43. Bellegarda teaches dependent claim 12 by the following:

"further comprising a handwriting tablet, said handwriting tablet providing a sample of handwriting of said visitors" at col. 7 lines 1-8. The sample of handwriting (the concise handwriting pattern, such as a signature) of a visitor can lead to the identification of the visitor as taught at col. 1 lines 28-40.

44. Claims 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) and Coffin et al. (U.S. Patent 5,991,429) as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Pare Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,764,789).

45. As per claim 15, Kamise and Coffin teach an unmanned reception machine in which pictures of the user are tested for biometrics as taught above. Coffin teaches the use of biometrics to identify a particular person through a comparison at col. 1 line 59 to col. 2 line 2. Coffin further teaches that the image data for comparison can be stored in a database at col. 1 lines 41-46. Coffin does not teach the use of the Internet to compare the biometric database. Pare does teach the use of a web interface at Fig. 1 with the "Network" and "The Internet". Through the network and Internet, the machines are capable of accessing the biometric database. By connecting to the biometric database, the system gathers information needed to identify the visitors. Storing the information across a web interface allows the system to access information

that is not stored on the local machine. Multiple copies of the same information do not have to be stored on each terminal, thus less storage is required for each terminal.

46. Coffin and Pare teach dependent claim 19 by the following:
"herein obtaining information about said visitor from a plurality of sources comprises at least one of performing a search on the Internet, searching a publicly available database, searching a database of visitor information obtained from said automated kiosk, and searching a local document database" at Pare Fig. 1 with the "Network" and "The Internet". Coffin teaches that a database is created with the biometric data, such as a picture of a face, at col. 1 lines 41-46. Coffin further teaches that the information in the database is compared with a current picture at col. 1 lines 59-61. Furthermore, Pare teaches that a search of the Internet is used to find the biometric database at Fig. 1.

47. Claims 26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hobbs (U.S. Patent 5,987,454).

48. As per claim 26, Kamise teaches an unmanned reception system in which a visitor database is prepared from the visitor information, such as a picture of the visitor's face. Kamise does not teach that the visitor information includes personnel information. Hobbs does teach a system in which a database consists of personnel records at col. 1 lines 40-44. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to include personnel information with the visitor information taught by Kamise. A system that stored personnel

information would benefit the company by tracking personnel activity and by serving as a security system that can detect the difference between personnel and visitors. By including personnel information, the reception system would be able to recognize the personnel. The system would then be able to track employees to determine time of arrival and departure. The system would also be able to serve as a security means by being able to determine the visitors from the personnel.

49. Hobbs teaches dependent claim 29 by the following:

"further comprising using said personnel information to annotate documents" at col. 7 lines 34-50. As taught at col. 1 lines 40-44, Hobbs teaches that a database can consist of personnel information. Hobbs teaches that the document is dynamically augmented, or annotated, with a link that provides information on a particular record. The record that is displayed through the link can consist of a personnel record that is stored in the database.

51. Hobbs teaches dependent claim 30 by the following:

"wherein using said personnel information to annotate documents further comprises replacing at least one of a plurality of names with hypertext links to said personnel information" at col. 7 lines 34-50. As taught at col. 1 lines 40-44, Hobbs teaches that a database can consist of personnel information. Hobbs teaches that the document is dynamically augmented, or annotated, with a link that provides information on a particular record. The record that is displayed through the link can consist of a personnel record that is stored in the database.

52. Claims 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamise (Unexamined Japanese Patent JP 10246041A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41) and Hobbs (U.S. Patent 5,987,454) as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Klein et al. (U.S. Patent 6,209,000).

53. As per claim 27, Kamise and Hobbs teach a system in which an unmanned reception machine acquires pictures of visitors and stores them in a database. They do not teach the plurality of linkages between the personnel information and the information acquired through a sensor. As shown in the "EMP" Table 200 of Fig. 2, the employee table contains a link between the employee and the picture data, data that is acquired through a camera (sensor). The link between the information is shown by the fact that the pictures are stored in the same row as the employee. It would have been obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time of the invention to provide a link between the personnel information and the additional information acquired through a sensor, or a camera in this instance. By providing a link between the image data and the personnel data, the system maintains the integrity of the database. If no link existed, the personnel information would not refer to the picture data associated with each employee.

54. Klein teaches dependent claim 28 by the following:

"wherein said additional information comprises at least one of an image, a time of entering said personnel information" at Fig. 2 "EMP" Table 200 at column "Picture 206". The table stores a picture associated with each employee found in the database.

Conclusion

PRIOR ART CITED

Kamise	JP 10246041 A Machine Assisted Translation pages 1-41
Takasaki et al.	JP 03129990 A Only English Abstract
Herz	U.S. Patent 6,020,883
McAbian	U.S. Patent 5,845,261
Kanevsky	U.S. Patent 6,334,109
Motomiya	U.S. Patent 6,189,783
Coffin	U.S. Patent 5,991,429
Bellegarda	U.S. Patent 5,502,774
Pare	U.S. Patent 5,764,789
Hobbs	U.S. Patent 5,987,454
Klein	U.S. Patent 6,209,000

55. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Schrantz whose telephone number is (703) 305-7690. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. 8:30-5:00.

56. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications. The phone number for TC 2100 Customer Service is (703) 306-5631.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Steve Schrantz
April 7, 2003

SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER